2.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporation*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS— Would the proposed project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SETTING

Each of the proposed alternatives traverses a distinct route of varying length. Since all of the routes generally travel through highly urbanized areas in city streets, the likelihood of encountering other buried utility and service systems is high, however the chance of construction activities accidentally contacting underground facilities during construction is low. State law requires consultation with Underground Service Alert (see regulatory setting) and on-site verification and probing to avoid unidentified systems.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project and alternatives are located entirely within the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco. Utilities which may be encountered by the proposed project include underground facilities such as buried water, storm drain, sanitary sewer, telephone, cable, network fiber optic, natural gas, electrical traffic loops, and electrical distribution lines. Overhead utilities include telephone, cable, and electrical distribution and transmission lines. Each of the potentially effected services and their providers are shown in Table 2.16-1.

TABLE 2.16-1
LOCAL UTILITY AND SERVICE PROVIDERS

Utility or Service	Provider
Water and Sewer Service	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
Sewer and Storm Drain Maintenance	City of San Francisco Department of Public Works
Water Line Maintenance	SF Department of Water
Wastewater Collection and Treatment at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant	SF Bureau of Water Pollution Control/SF Bureau of Street and Sewer Repair
Garbage Services	San Francisco Department of Public Works / Norcal Waste Systems, Inc./Sunset Scavenger/Golden Gate Disposal & Recycling
Landfills	Norcal Waste Systems, Inc.
Telephone	SBC
Cable	AT&T, Comcast
Natural Gas and Electric Service	PG&E
Other Communications	MCI, Level 3 Communications, Sprint, Teleport Communications

ALTERNATIVE 1

Alternative 1 is the shortest and most direct route and therefore has the least likelihood of encountering existing underground utilities. The route would extend through an existing 1,400 foot double-circuit duct bank along Illinois Street from Marin Street to 25th Street and includes a bore under Islais Creek. The portions of the route which traverse existing City streets would result in a potential for similar conflicts with existing utilities as the proposed project. Service providers along the route would be similar to those shown in Table 2.16-1.

ALTERNATIVE 2

PG&E's PEA indicates that Alternative 2 would have the potential to result in conflicts with existing utilities and the railroad. An existing 72-inch underground sewer line is located in Quint Street. A separation of 5 feet is required from the power line. There is also an operating railway track along Quint Street. Special construction procedures and operational limitations would be required to construct the power line in close proximity to the railway, as described in the Project Description. Service providers along the route would be similar to those shown in Table 2.16-1.

ALTERNATIVE 3

Alternative 3 is also the shortest and most direct route and therefore has the least likelihood of encountering existing underground utilities. The route would extend through an existing

1,400 foot double circuit duct bank along Illinois Street from Marin Street to 25th Street and includes crossing over Islais Creek. The portions of the route which traverse existing City streets would result in a potential for similar conflicts with existing utilities as the proposed project. Service providers along the route would be similar to those shown in Table 2.16-1.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The setting for the No Project Alternative is the same as current conditions since construction of a 2.5 mile cable project would not occur. This alternative does not meet PG&E's objective to provide necessary upgrades to the electrical transmission system serving the City in order to improve reliability, increase capacity, and provide a critical component needed to meet the goal of closing PG&E's Hunters Point Power Plant pursuant to PG&E's agreement with the City.[1]

REGULATORY CONTEXT

Utility operators are required to protect underground structures as detailed in Title 1, Division 5, Chapter 3.1, Article 2, 4216 of California Government Code. This law requires that an excavator must contact a regional notification center at least two days prior to excavation of any subsurface installations, in this case the Underground Service Alert. Any utility provider seeking to begin an excavation project can call Underground Service Alert's toll-free hotline. Underground Service Alert, in turn, would notify the utilities that may have buried lines within 1,000 feet of the excavation. Representatives of the utilities are required to mark the specific location of their facilities within the work area prior to the start of excavation. The excavator is required to probe and expose the underground facilities by hand prior to using power equipment.

IMPACTS DISCUSSION OF UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

The methodology to determine impacts to utilities consisted of reviewing maps, land use plans, and technical data summarizing utilities in the project area. To determine the significance of the impacts anticipated from the proposed project, the project's effects were evaluated as provided under the revised CEQA guidelines. These guidelines are summarized in the checklist provided at the beginning of this section.

PROPOSED PROJECT

It is not expected that the proposed project would result in a significant impact to existing utility and service systems. Only short term construction impacts are expected. PG&E states in its PEA that all existing electrical service would remain operational throughout project construction and no interruptions are anticipated. Because construction for the switchyards would occur in

[1] In 1998, the City and County of San Francisco and PG&E entered into an agreement to close Hunters Point Power Plant as soon as 1) it was no longer needed to sustain electric reliability in San Francisco and surrounding areas, and 2) the California Independent System Operator authorizes closure of the plant.

locations where PG&E has previously installed equipment, the location of existing utilities on the sites should be known. Therefore, the potential for accidental utility system disruption is very low, and would be a less-than-significant impact. The Proposed Project meets PG&E's objective to provide necessary upgrades to the electrical transmission system serving the City in order to improve reliability and increase capacity.

ALTERNATIVE 1

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 1 would not result in a significant impact to existing utility and service systems

ALTERNATIVE 2

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not result in a significant impact to existing utility and service systems

ALTERNATIVE 3

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not result in a significant impact to existing utility and service systems.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative does not meet PG&E's objective to provide necessary upgrades to the electrical transmission system serving the City in order to improve reliability and increase capacity. Therefore, the impacts to utilities from implementing the No Project Alternative are greater than the proposed project.

CHECKLIST IMPACT CONCLUSIONS

a) Neither the proposed project nor the alternatives would result in wastewater treatment requirements which exceed those set by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (San Francisco Bay Region). The project would not result in any expansion of urban development in the area leading to additional wastewater generation or potential to exceed treatment requirements. None of the project alternatives are expected to result in new sources of point or non-point water pollution during construction and therefore existing standards would not be exceeded. The contractor would provide portable toilets on-site during construction, which would then be removed from the site on a regular basis for servicing off-site. This would be the only wastewater source associated with the proposed project. The amount of wastewater generated by workers during project construction would be minimal and temporary in nature and would not adversely affect the treatment plant that would receive the wastewater. Therefore, because wastewater generated during project construction would result in a negligible and temporary increase, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB. It is determined that no impact would occur.

b) Neither the proposed project nor the alternatives would result in direct or indirect urban development or require new water or wastewater treatment facilities. During construction, portable restrooms would be used and maintained by PG&E and its construction crew. Upon completion of construction, the proposed project would not generate a significant demand for water or wastewater treatment, as the proposed power cable would be an unmanned, automated facility. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to exceed the existing water supplies or wastewater treatment capacity available to the proposed project, and would not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. It is determined that no impact would occur.

c) Implementation of either the proposed project or any of the three alternatives would not require new or expanded storm water drainage facilities; therefore no potential for significant environmental effects exists. A system of storm drainage facilities currently directs stormwater along the urban streets within the project area. Because the project would not change the amount of stormwater currently draining from the site, and would be located in a developed area with adequate existing drainage facilities, no new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities would be required. Upon completion of this construction, the project design would return site grading to existing topography within the City Streets and would not change existing stormwater drainage patterns within the right-of-way. No impact would occur.

d) It is expected that approximately 500 to 1,000 gallons of water per day would be required for street cleaning during underground trenching (CPUC, 2003). In addition to water for street cleaning, small amounts of water would be used during underground construction activities. Compared to the total daily volume of water delivered to the Peninsula, the water required for this project would be a minor amount. The water demand for construction of the project would have an adverse, but less-than-significant impact on the regional water supply and mitigation measures are not required.

e) The proposed project would result in minimal wastewater generation. As discussed in Impact Conclusion b, existing wastewater facilities are adequate to accommodate the minor demand generated by the proposed project. Therefore, the wastewater treatment providers serving the area would have adequate capacity, in addition to their existing commitments, to serve the proposed project's projected demand. Portable restrooms would be used and maintained during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.

f) Each of the alternatives would generate some waste material. Asphalt, concrete, trenching spoils, and other excavated material would be reused by PG&E's construction crews on site to the greatest extent feasible. The PEA states that approximately 10,000 cubic yards of material would be generated with the proposed project. Material that cannot be reused as thermal backfill would be hauled to local asphalt manufacturers, recyclers, or transported to disposal facilities. During project construction, any solid waste generated on-site would be collected and transported by a private contractor. As such, collection and transport of project-related solid waste would have no impact on public services. The quantity of construction-related materials transported to the landfills would be minor relative to the

daily volumes handled at those facilities and would not substantially affect their remaining capacities. Project operation would not generate solid waste and would therefore not affect existing landfill capacities. Impacts would be adverse, but less-than-significant and mitigation measures would not be required.

g) The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, which emphasizes resource conservation through reduction, recycling, and reuse of solid waste guide solid waste management requires that localities conduct a Solid Waste Generation Study (SWGS) and develop a Source Reduction Recycling Element (SRRE). The proposed project would operate in accordance with these applicable Solid Waste Management Policy Plans by including recycling activities as part of the proposed project. PG&E has committed to following all solid waste disposal regulations as part of this project for any of the action alternatives. As identified in Checklist Impacts Discussion (f), landfills serving the site would have sufficient capacity to accommodate project construction solid waste disposal needs, and the disposal of project refuse would not require the need for new or expanded landfill facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste disposal limits and landfill capacities. This potential impact is determined to be less-than-significant.

REFERENCES – Utilities And Service Systems

California Public Utilities Commission. July 2003. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Line Project.

Essex Environmental. December 2003. PG&E Potrero to Hunters Point 115 kV Cable Project Proponent's Environmental Assessment.